UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/820,508	03/29/2001	Rabindranath Dutta	AUS920010012US1	5085

35525 7590 08/12/2004	EXAMINER
IBM CORP (YA)	NGUYEN, MAIKHANH

C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P.O. BOX 802333	2176	

DALLAS, TX 75380

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	09/820,508	DUTTA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Maikhanh Nguyen	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>*29 March 2001*</u>.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>*7/10/01 & 8/5/02*</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: original application 03/29/2001;

IDS filed 07/10/2001 and 08/05/2002.

2.   Claims 1-39 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 12, 19, 23, 25,

27-28, 30, 32-33, 35, and 37-38 are independent claims.

Claim Objections

3.   Claims 20, 25, 27, 30, 32, 35 and 37 are objected to because of the following

informalities:

        - "at least one of the at least one salient features" (claim 25, lines 3-4; claim 27,

lines 22-24; claim 30, lines 16-17; claim 32, lines 4-5; claim 35, lines 32-33; and claim

37, lines 20-21) should probably read "the at least one salient feature".

        - "the data processing system of claim 19 the processing unit further" (claim 20,

line 1) should probably read "the data processing system of claim 19, wherein the

processing unit further."

        Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the
> subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 3, 14, 17, 19, 26-28, 30, 32-33, 35, and 37 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and

distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- The following phrases lack antecedent basis:

* "the audibly presenting step" (claim 3, line 16; and claim 14, lines 2-3)

* "the document" (claim 19, line 26; claim 28, line 29; claim 33, lines 11-12;

and claim 38, lines 27-28)

* "the page" (claim 27, line 20; claim 32, line 1; and claim 17, line 17)

- The following phrases are indefinite:

* "a salient feature" (claim 19, lines 27-28)

* "a non-visual manner" (claim 25, lines 5-6; claim 27, line 25; claim 30, line

18; claim 32, lines 6-7; claim 35, line 1; and claim 37, lines 22-23)

Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b),by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2)a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a)shall have the effects for the purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2)of such treaty in the English language; or " (Emphasis added.)

Claims 1-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Kiraly et**

al. (U.S. 6,564,186 – filed 10/2001, Continuation of application No. 09/164,897 – filed

10/1998).

As to independent claim 1, Kiraly teaches a method in a data processing system

for presenting content in a document *(Abstract and Fig. 4)*, the method comprising:

- parsing the document for a salient feature *(e.g., the text-reader software ...*

analyzes the entire text-based data source in preparation for highlighting portions of the

text-based data; col. 9, lines 23-34 and item 420, Fig. 4); and

- responsive to locating the salient feature within the document, presenting the

salient feature in a manner other than visually *(e.g., the text-reader software highlights*

the selected section of the text-based data ... the synthesized speech signals and the audio

signals are rendered audible with the highlighting of the selected text; col. 10, lines 53-

67/ col. 11, lines 20-25 and item 460, Fig. 4).

As to dependent claim 2, Kiraly teaches determining whether to present

additional portions of the document *(e.g., after the highlighted text is displayed 'by*

rendering synthesized speech signals' to the user with visual impairment, the user may

decide if he/she wants additional information of the document to be displayed; col. 2,

lines 40-57).

As to dependent claim 3, Kiraly teaches the determining step is performed after

the audibly presenting step *(e.g., generating synthesized speech signals representative of*

the highlighted word and rendering the synthesized speech signals audible synchronously

with the displaying of the highlighted text such that text-based information and

corresponding audible information can be perceived simultaneously by the user; col. 2,

lines 40-57/col. 10, lines 52-56 /col. 11, lines 44-67).

As to dependent claim 4, Kiraly teaches the salient feature is selected from,

among other things, underlining, bold-facing *(col. 7, lines 9-16)*.

As to dependent claim 5, Kiraly teaches the salient feature is presented in an audible manner *(col.2, lines 53-57/col. 10, lines 52-56 /col.11, lines 44-67 and Figs.5A-B)*.

As to dependent claim 6, Kiraly teaches the salient feature is presented in a tactile manner *(e.g., text to be spoken; item 432, Fig.4)*.

As to dependent claim 7, Kiraly teaches the document is selected from, among other things, a hypertext markup language *(Word Wide Web; Abstract / col.2, lines 52-57)*.

As to dependent claim 8, Kiraly teaches the resource description file is one of a resource description format file *(col.9, lines 11-16)* or an extensible markup language schema file.

As to dependent claim 9, Kiraly teaches the markup language is at least one of hypertext markup language *(col.3, lines 53-57)* and resource description framework *(col.2, lines 53-57 and col.9, lines 11-16)*.

As to dependent claim 10, Kiraly teaches presents the salient feature by highlighting the salient feature within the document instead of presenting the salient feature in a manner other than visually *(col.6, lines 20-38/col.7, lines 10-23/col.10, lines 52-67)*.

As to dependent claim 11, Kiraly teaches the salient feature is indicated within the document *(col.2, lines 30-col.3, line 43)*.

As to independent claim 12, it is directed to a data processing system for performing the method of claim 1, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 13-18, they include the same limitations as in claims 2-7, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to independent claim 19, the rejection of claim 12 above is incorporated herein in full. Additionally, claim 19 further recites:

- a bus system;

- a communication unit;

- a memory; and

- a processing unit

Kiraly teaches:

- a bus system *(data bus 102; Fig.1)*;

- a communication unit *(a communication device 118 ; Fig.1)*;

- a memory *(a volatile memory 106 and data storage unit 110; Fig.1)*; and

- a processing unit *(the central processor 104; Fig.1)*

As to dependent claim 20, it includes the same limitations as in claim 2, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 21-22, they include the same limitations as in claims 9-10, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to independent claim 23, it is directed to a computer program product for implementing the method of claim 1, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 24, it includes the same limitations as in claim 2, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to independent claim 25, Kiraly teaches a method in a data processing system for presenting content in a document *(Fig.4)*, comprising:

- receiving a request for a document *(e.g., a document can be retrieved by accessing a MS file; item 410, Fig.4)* having at least one salient feature *(e.g., a section of text to be spoken; item 432, Fig.4)*;

- determining the at least one salient feature *(e.g., automatically select a section of text to be spoken; item 432, Fig.4)*; and

- in response to the request, presenting at least one of the at least one salient features in a non-visual manner before presenting non-salient content in a non-visual manner *(e.g., generating speech output for highlighted text; item 434, Fig.4 and displaying highlighted text while simultaneously rendering speech output based on the context of the text; item 460, Fig.4)*.

As to dependent claim 26, Kiraly teaches determining further comprises, among other things, means for analyzing the document *(e.g., analyzes entire text-based data source for highlight output; item 420,Fig.4)* for, among other things, underlined text *(e.g., marking the document, such as underlining; col.7, lines 23-34)*.

As to independent claim 27, the rejection of claim 25 above is incorporated herein in full.

As to independent claim 28, Kiraly teaches a method for processing a requested document *(Abstract and Fig.4)*, comprising:

- analyzing content of the document for at least one salient feature *(e.g., the text-reader software ... analyzes the entire text-based data source in preparation for highlighting portions of the text-based data; col.9, lines 23-34 and item 420, Fig.4)*

- denoting the at least one salient feature separately from the content *(e.g., automatically select a section of text to highlight, item 420; automatically select a section*

of text to be spoken, item 432; automatically select or update image or animation to be

displayed, item 442; and automatically select or update sound effect to be generated;

item 452, Fig.4) and

- sending the document and the separately denoted at least one salient feature to a

requester of the document *(e.g., displaying highlighted text while simultaneously*

rendering speech output, image/animation and/or sound effects based on the context of

the text; item 460, Fig.4).

As to dependent claim 29, Kiraly teaches denoting the at least one salient feature

separately from the content further comprises, among other things, denoting the at least

one salient feature in a file *(e.g., MS word file; item 410, Fig.4)*.

As to independent claim 30, it is directed to a data processing system for

performing the method of claim 25, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 31, it includes the same limitations as in claim 26, and is

similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to independent claim 32, it is directed to a data processing system for

performing the method of claim 25, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to independent claim 33, it is directed to a data processing system for

performing the method of claim 28, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 34, it includes the same limitations as in claim 29, and is

similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to independent claims 35, it is directed to a computer program product for

implementing the method of claims 25, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 36, it includes the same limitations as in claim 26, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to independent claim 37, it is directed to a computer program product for implementing the method of claims 25, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to independent claim 38, it is directed to a computer program product for implementing the method of claim 28, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 39, it includes the same limitations as in claim 36, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

6.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Cragun	U.S Patent No. 5,461,399	issued: Oct. 25, 1995
Noguchi	U.S Patent No. 5,983,184	issued: Nov. 9, 1999
Dutta et al.	U.S. 2002/0111974 A1	issued: Aug.15, 2002
Weiss et al.	U.S Patent No. 6,738,95	issued: May. 18, 2004

Petrie et al., "Inexpensive Tactile Interaction For Blind Computer Users: Two Application Domains", Sensory Disabilities Resarch Unit, University Of Hertfordshire, IEEE, 1997, pp. 1-3.

Zajicek et al., "Enabling Visually Impaired People To Use The Internet", School of Computing and Mathematical Sciences, Oxford Brookes, IEEE, 1997, pp. 1-3.

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 306-

0092. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30

pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on (703) 305-9792.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Maikhanh Nguyen
August 2, 2004

SANJIV SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER